

## REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the reference signs L1 and L2 were not shown. The specification has been amended to delete such reference signs L1 and L2, thereby obviating this objection.

The Examiner also objected to the specification as lacking a proper antecedent basis for the limitations of Claim 8. Although Claim 8 has been cancelled, the specification has been amended to provide such a proper antecedent basis.

The Examiner indicated that dependent Claim 15 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Claim 11 has been re-written to include all of the salient limitations of dependent Claim 15, and further to clarify some of the language therein. Thus, it is believed that Claims 11 through 14 are allowable.

New independent Claims 21 and 22 define the invention in a manner that is similar to Claim 11, but exclude some of the limitations of Claim 11 that are not believed to be material to the patentability of the invention. Specifically, Claim 21 defines the invention as a transfer case, as opposed to Claim 11 which defines the invention as a vehicle drive train assembly including a source of rotational power that is connected to a transfer case. Claim 21 also defines "first and second" output members for the transfer case, as opposed to "front and rear" members. Claim 22 defines the invention in the same manner as Claim 21, but further includes a source of rotational power and first and second rotatably driven axles (similar to Claim 11). Thus, it is believed that Claims 21 and 22 define the invention over the art of record.

OK  
MB  
9-9-03  
The courtesy of the Examiner in granting the undersigned attorney a personal interview on July 9, 2003 is gratefully acknowledged. During that interview, the language of new independent Claim 21 was discussed in light of the art of record. Although no formal agreement was reached during the interview, the Examiner indicated that the patentability of Claim 21 would be considered when a formal amendment was filed.